

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **7 February 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-25. Claims 7-12 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6, 13-19, 20-21 and 24-25 were allowed. Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101


Examiner rejected claims 7-12 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are drawn to a “program” per se as recited in each preamble and as such are drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the preamble of independent claim 7 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention are drawn to statutory subject matter.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 7 as presently amended is in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 8-12 and 22-23, which depend upon claim 7, are for the same reason in condition for allowance and for reason of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 20 February 2007

Shun Yao
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com